DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 619 SP 027 917

AUTHOR Cochran, Leslie H.
TITLE Teacher Education at the Crossroads: An Opportunity for Excellence.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 31p.; Position paper prepared by the Provost of Southeast Missouri State University and adopted by the Board of Regents.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); College School Cooperation; Competency Based Teacher Education; *Educational Trends; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Improvement; Research Needs; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Southeast Missouri State University

ABSTRACT

In response to the need to remain a leader in teacher education in Missouri, Southeast Missouri State University analyzed a variety of sources that suggested new directions in teacher education. A review was conducted of current literature, and a study was made of the revised National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards. ERIC Resource Reviews from the Clearinghouse on Teacher Education were studied as well as current newsletters from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). Course syllabi currently used in the campus teacher education program were inspected, and a cost/benefit analysis was made of the "Report of the Task Force on Alternatives for Clinical Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education." Informal comments and written suggestions were solicited from individuals on and off campus. Recommendations, directions, and implications for the future of teacher education, with particular emphasis on programs at Southeast Missouri State University, are presented. Topics covered include: field based experiences; school/university relationships; competency based education; research orientation; academic standards; program content; accreditation standards; and cost analysis. Seventeen recommendations for Southeast Missouri State University's teacher education program are listed. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278619

TEACHER EDUCATION AT THE CROSSROADS:

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR EXCELLENCE

Leslie H. Cochran

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. H. Cochran

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP027917

Leslie H. Cochran, Provost
Southeast Missouri State University

TEACHER EDUCATION AT THE CROSSROADS: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR EXCELLENCE

Southeast Missouri State University was established in 1873 as a normal school to meet the educational needs of individuals in this region of Missouri. Over the years, the University has built a tradition of strong regional and statewide leadership in education. As the University diversified its mission in the twentieth century, this rich heritage in teacher education provided a solid basis for the development of a multi-purpose University.

What Southeast Missouri State University becomes in the future as an educator of teachers will inevitably reflect what it has traditionally been. The strength of the teacher education program is a hallmark of the University. The teachers and administrators in the schools of Missouri with undergraduate and graduate degrees from this University give witness to the stature of the program. The reputation of the program provides the essential components and foundation for strong leadership in the future. The University has built the tradition of excellence by responding appropriately to the need for change. At its best, in fact, the University has been a leader in providing teacher education and the schools of the region with new direction when the need for such direction was clear. Today, the demands of leadership in teacher education mandate a change in direction both on campus and off campus. How well we respond to these demands will determine in substantial measure whether the University continues its tradition of excellence in teacher education.

Concerns for the Future

During the past quarter century, the attention devoted to education in the United States has increased dramatically. Most of this attention, however,

SP027917

has been negative. American education has been widely criticized for inequality of educational opportunity, inadequacy of classroom instruction, insufficiency of graduation requirements, and ill-advised emphasis on its social rather than its academic repsonsibilities. These criticisms and others have generated a fundamental concern in the Nation for the quality of education at almost every level.

With this concern has arisen an unhappy tension between educational practice and public sentiment and, increasingly, between educational practice and professional expectations. Various national and regional panels have been convened to address questions regarding education at the elementary and secondary school levels. More recently, similar scrutiny has been aimed at higher education and, in particular, at the education of prospective teachers. A recent National Center for Education Information report summarizes the growing criticism of teacher education in colleges and universities. The report asserts that "no area of education is under more severe attack than teacher education and certification." Further, the report notes that education courses are equally attacked by those who have taken them, by policy-makers, by the media, and by the public. Unfortunately, as the report indicates, while these attacks may not be entirely justified, little hard data exists to counteract them (17).

In **Using Research to Improve Teacher Education: The Nebraska Consortium**, Egbert and Kluender make much the same point by invoking not the criticisms but the challenging opportunity now presented by renewed public and academic interest in teacher education:

> The spotlight for educational improvement in the 1980's is on pre-service education. The task of preparing a whole new cadre of teachers is a wonderfully challenging opportunity. Old and well worn curriculums must be examined in light of the knowledge and skills beginning teachers need to provide effective instruction in schools today (15:128).

In Missouri, the Action Plan adopted in March, 1984, by the State Board of Education presents a series of reforms that are deemed essential if the educational

system in the State is to achieve the level of excellence expected by the general public. Making fifteen major recommendations for change, the Board calls for modifications at all levels of education. The Board notes specifically the need for change in teacher education by emphasizing that any significant effort to improve schools must involve, and ultimately depends on, teachers. Reform in teacher preparation is, thus, an essential element in the process of improving education in the schools. In fact, the Board expresses a fundamental concern that "the present system of training teachers is archaic in many respects and out of touch with conditions and needs of our schools" (22:11).

At the institutional level, too, there has been an expression of concern and suggestions that major new directions be considered in teacher education. Most recent among these intiatives is the "Report of the Task Force on Alternatives for Clinical Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education," which served as the catalyst for this paper. Clearly, what began as criticism of the schools has become a demand for change in the education of prospective teachers. For Southeast Missouri State University, an institution historically committed to excellence in education, the need for change is in fact an unparalleled opportunity to strengthen teacher education. To do so, however, requires more than a general awareness of the challenge. Recommendations for strengthening the teacher education component of the University require careful analysis of the potential for change, including analysis of a variety of resources that may suggest new directions in teacher education.

The recommendations in this paper are the product of such analysis. First, a review was conducted of current literature, including such publications as the **Journal of Teacher Education** and the **National Association of Laboratory Schools Journal.** Second, a study was made of the revised accreditation standards as proposed by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in

September, 1984. Third, major ERIC Resource Reviews, five in particular, on current education issues were studied. These publications, compiled by the national Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, contain abstracts of over six hundred articles and research studies. Fourth, current newsletters from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education were reviewed. Fifth, an inspection was made of course syllabi used in the current campus teacher education program. Sixth, recent research studies and other publications in the area of teacher education were studied. Seventh, the "Report of the Task Force on Alternatives for Clinical Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education" was studied and analyzed from a cost/benefit perspective. And eighth, informal comments and written suggestions were solicited from individuals both on and off campus.

Directions for the Future

While teacher education has come under severe attack, the profession has attempted to respond in a commendable fashion. Research efforts have been undertaken to assess and document new initiatives in the preparation of teachers. Innovation and experimentation have, in fact, become a dominant theme throughout the literature. For example, the Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, through its ERIC database, has identified over 170 current studies focused on promoting change in teacher education institutions. A review of these sources reveals that responsible proposals are being made to improve virtually every segment of the teacher education process. While many of these proposals have not yet been implemented, the momentum for change is rapidly increasing. Large numbers of them will soon find place in teacher education programs.

Of course, not all of the questions regarding these new directions have been resolved. It is clear, however, that major reforms are inevitable, and that substantial changes in teacher education will be implemented during the remainder of this decade.

The opportunities for state and national leadership are present for those institutions willing to accept the challenge to leadership in teacher education. An individual program such as the one on this campus need not, certainly should not, incorporate every new concept being discussed in the profession. A strong commitment, however, to the most viable new directions explored in the literature seems imperative.

The discussion which follows is an attempt to explore the potential for reform in teacher education at the University in six general categories: Field-Based Experiences, School/University Relationships, Clinical Experiences, Competency-Based Education, Research Orientation, and Academic Standards.

Field-Based Experience. The last twenty years have seen field-based education emerge as one of the most important elements in teacher education. Various models are available that demonstrate the success of integrating field-based experiences into individual courses or even an entire program. These models range from course-specific experiences mandated for every course in the professional education sequence to sets of experiences required for completion of the program. Typically, the focus of such activities is

> specific and sensory rather than general and abstract types of knowledge. They foster common sense about the teaching role and offer a setting for determining whether one's personal characteristics are compatible with the job....Over a period....students would be assigned to apprenticeship experiences in a variety of schools, classrooms and communities. The emphasis would be on learning about the array of curriculum resources, roles of school personnel, classroom management systems, characteristics of children, etc. (25:16).

Field-based programs generally include a hierarchical set of experiences that progress from normal observations to student teaching. The Clearinghouse on Teacher Education reports one hundred recent studies focused on the effectiveness of student teaching and field experience programs. These studies place strong emphasis on integrating theory with practice, nurturing communications between universities and local schools, and moving toward educational programs that fully coordinate

on-campus instruction and off-campus experiences. The research indicates that the field-based aspect of these programs commonly receives the highest rating from prospective and regularly employed teachers. The same research has produced significant criticism of the content taught in other (theoretical) segments of teacher education programs. Somewhat ironically, the research also suggests that effective integration of formal instruction and field-based experience may well be threatened by a lack of commitment from faculty members in higher education.

Not all institutions of higher education are in this category, however. Northern Arizona University, for example, has totally reconstituted its teacher education program, and is in the process of creating a new "field-oriented" program. All of the alternatives suggested by this University's Task Force on Alternatives for Clinical Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education incorporate signficant increases in the amount of field-based experience. Whatever reforms are made in teacher education programs in the immediate future, one thing is clear: effective integration of formal instruction and field-based experiences will be an important sign of excellence in these programs.

School/University Relationships. During the last decade, terms like "cooperation," "partnership," "linkage," and "collaboration" have been increasingly associated with model teacher education programs. Each of these terms has been used to characterize the essential field-based experience relationships between the university and local schools. The use of different terms, however, reflects more than a shift in educational jargon. Collaborative agreements are substantially different from their predecessors. They are usually written arrangements that are far more detailed and specific in terms of objectives to be achieved and responsibilities to be performed by individuals in the university and the local schools.

The evolution of such relationships is only now beginning to have its full impact on teacher preparation programs. Contemporary collaborative arrangements respond

directly to criticisms of their predecessors, particularly to the concern that teacher educators have often failed to ensure successful field experiences because they have distanced themselves from the schools.

> Institutions of higher education have remained aloof. Aside from the obvious role of preparing the men and women who teach in elementary and secondary schools, colleges and universities have been reluctant to enter into partnerships designed to enhance cooperation between the two sectors. In many cases, high schools have been left without any sense of what the colleges expect graduates to know.
>
> Recently, the relationship has begun to change. Representatives of higher education and the public schools are taking notice of each other (20:1).

True collaborative arrangements are receiving national acclaim. Rather than "using local schools" for field experiences, these agreements foster a team approach where despite their different roles, teachers and faculty members are treated as equals. The team approach eliminates the traditional hierarchical relationship between classroom teachers and university faculty members and stresses cooperation among all involved in the "partnerships."

> A cooperative effort between teacher preparation institutions and participating school districts is absolutely essential to the operation of an integrated field-theory approach. Obviously, the plan is most feasible when benefits to both insitutions are demonstrable. The program remains viable only when open lines of communication among practicing teachers, teachers in training, building principals, and teacher training institutions exist and institutions remain responsive to the needs of individual students (6:28).

While not all programs have established formal written agreements, an American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) report indicates that 75% of the surveyed teacher education institutions maintain partnerships with elementary/secondary schools, 19% are developing them, and only 6% are not pursuing such arrangements (1). Both the "Action Plan" of the Missouri State Board of Education and the alternatives suggested by the campus Task Force support the development of collaborative agreements. Most significantly, the new standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (to be discussed later) mandate

university-school collaboration and specify the need for objectives and activities clearly defined and jointly planned and evaluated by school and university personnel.

Clinical Experiences. In teacher education across the country, the term "clinical" typically refers to the controlled and simulated experiences gained by students in a university setting. While this may occur in a regular classroom, most of the literature deals with clinical experiences in a more formal laboratory setting. The alternatives suggested by the campus Task Force indicate the need of prospective teachers for clinical experiences and advocate that those offered by the University be improved substantially.

The clinical phase of a teacher education program focuses on teaching concepts, methods, and techniques in a laboratory environment. Most of the instruction provided during this phase, in fact, takes place in a university laboratory dedicated to controlled and simulated teaching experience. Micro teaching, simulation, and role playing are common techniques utilized in the laboratory. Practicing the delivery of specific knowledge to children, studying video tapes, diagnosing individual student problems, and analyzing one's own teaching are also common practices in this controlled setting. A model clinical program, such as the one at Bowling Green State University (7), expects clinical laboratory experiences to:

> Apply principles and theory in academic coursework to actual instruction
>
> Present individual cases or problems, either simulated or real, which relate directly to school-age youth
>
> Provide opportunity to study and practice analytic, diagnostic, and/or prescriptive skills which are essential to maximize pupil learning outcomes
>
> Develop explicit performance expectations for teacher education students
>
> Offer systematic feedback on process or product demonstrations to develop and/or improve student performance
>
> Provide students with direction from professional education faculty and from other professional personnel

The cost analysis report of January 15 (see Appendix A) on the recommendations of the campus Task Force, includes a Clinical Education Laboratory that requires $75,000 in one-time costs and approximately $50,000 in on-going expenditures. The Laboratory is composed of two major rooms: one area contains a wide range of equiment for micro-teaching, videotaping, and utilizing computers; the second area provides a regular classroom area amenable to various types of instruction and observation. This laboratory is an important component of each of the alternatives recommended by the Task Force.

Competency-Based Education. Competency-based teacher education (CBTE) refers to efforts to prepare prospective teachers to acquire specific competencies deemed critical for effective teaching. The rationale for this approach to teacher education is similar to the methodology employed in basic levels of instruction: namely, "be clear about what is to be learned, design lessons that fit the objectives, teach the lesson, test for learning, provide feedback, and redesign the lesson and teach again" (16:31).

During the 1970's, CBTE was viewed as the best way to professionalize teacher preparation programs. By the mid-70's, CBTE came under attack for being too technical and for increasing the specification of skills to be learned that had no compelling link to student learning. Since that time, however, CBTE proponents have focused their efforts on selected aspects in the teacher preparation process. As a result, the validated knowledge base of many CBTE programs has become far more creditable. This fact, plus the increasing propensity of states and school systems to require performanced-based teacher education programs, has brought renewed attention to CBTE. Also, research evidence is now becoming available that shows the positive effect of CBTE on teacher attitudes and behavior (16). Recent national interest in measuring educational outcomes has also provided considerable support for reexamination of the value of competency-based instruction. Prudent use of

the approach may well prove beneficial to teacher education programs, both internally and externally.

Research Orientation. Teacher education has experienced severe criticism in recent years for its limited research orientation. While the number of large scale studies of classroom teaching has increased dramatically since the mid-70's, these findings have not been incorporated into many teacher education programs. Essentially, there are three critical deficiencies that must be addressed if substantial improvement is to be made in teacher education programs in the research area.

First, major criticisms are aimed at teacher education programs because the "body of knowledge" taught in these programs is not based in research. Watts, for example, has "little confidence" in teacher preparation programs since they "attempt to function without basing practices upon empirical knowledge," and are thus doomed to continued "inferior status" (29:48). Like Watts, many critics believe that teacher educators fail to keep abreast of educational research, frequently rely upon expert opinion or group consensus, and show little inclination to utilize research data which are presently available.

> The current research and development activities of teacher preparation programs present a bleak scene. Program procedures, policies, and practices appear to be generally unrelated to research data, but based instead upon concepts, perceptions, and "common sense." The research that is performed is often poorly designed and controlled. Most of the research activity is conducted on an individual basis by education professors and directed toward areas of personal interest rather than professional importance (29:49).

Second, the problematical state of teacher education programs is tied to the lack of an effective research and development system. Few teacher preparation programs, in fact, are involved with research and development units. Again, Watts reports that barely 10% of these programs have working relationships with research units, and only 4.5% of institutions with teacher education programs have a formal relationship with a specially funded unit. Nonetheless, few authorities doubt that

the improvement of the programs, the profession, and various outreach efforts to the schools are directly related to the development of a credible rationale for change found through research.

Third, individual faculty members themselves often have not developed a commitment to productive inquiry and scholarship. Without such commitment, teacher education programs will inevitably deteriorate. With it, they will be characterized by intellectual curiosity, experimentation, scepticism, and rigorous application of the very principles of scholarship taught in the program. As one commentator states it:

> Those schools of education now engaged in inquiry must integrate its processes and products far more substantially than they have into their training programs. Those schools of education not now engaged in inquiry must learn how to do so....Such changes will threaten many....in the profession. It is a threat that must be faced. To do otherwise offers no alternatives but mediocrity (18:27).

Academic Standards. Raising admission standards for teacher education programs, establishing exit and graduation requirements, and testing the knowledge of graduates prior to certification are items high on the Nation's agenda. In Missouri, steps have already been taken in some of these areas. Prospective teachers are now required to achieve a composite score of at least 18 on the ACT test (or its equivalent) prior to entering a teacher education program. A minimum grade point average of 2.5 has been established for prospective teachers to be eligible for certification. Certification requirements themselves have been upgraded for all teachers. New procedures and criteria have been established for evaluating all teacher education programs.

The follow-up research on these changes, both in volume and quality, is admittedly limited. Whether these new standards will have a measurable impact on teaching effectiveness is thus yet to be determined. The movement to upgrade career entry standards for teachers, however, will no doubt continue. To improve the status of teachers, basic levels of academic competence will be established and, hence, the quality of entering teachers will improve. In turn, the quality of students entering

education programs will increase, allowing for the introduction of a more academically rigorous teacher education curriculum. Special recruitment efforts aimed at the academically superior student may be a means to enhance this overall effort. Regardless of such efforts, the deans of education at land grant universities and major private universities indicate that there will likely be reduced teacher education enrollments in most institutions (16).

Questions of Program Content

In addition to achievement standards for entering students and for graduates, the knowledge base of teacher education programs has received specific scrutiny. As one commentator states it, "even the most aggressive apologists for teacher education acknowledge that improvements can and should be made in virtually all programs" (16:40). Much of the criticism in this area, in fact, emerges from within the discipline. Educational leaders are often highly critical of the inabililty or unwillingness of educators to incorporate research into the preservice education program. Specifically, these leaders complain that programs contain limited information on effective schools and effective teaching, brain research, motivation and learning, special education/multicultural education, and learning/teaching styles. Others decry the failure of education programs to focus their attention on the characteristics and needs of the local communities likely to employ their graduates. The concern of these educators is well taken given the body of research that establishes the relationship between local environments and student characteristics and the learning process. They emphasize the need for prospective teachers to interact with school principals and individuals in the community as they prepare to become teachers (15). Several authorities criticize teacher education programs for neglecting to teach decision-making skills and for allowing students to graduate with a limited understanding of administrative, team, and supervisory leadership. Perhaps Watts summarizes best the criticism

of teacher education programs for their failure to imbue these curricula with the existing knowledge base:

> Unfortunately, teacher preparation programs are not systematically teaching that knowledge to new practitioners. It is time for the profession to identify and accept a body of professional knowledge and assume responsibility for passing that knowledge on to teacher trainees....Although pedagogical knowledge is incomplete, teacher preparation programs cannot afford to wait for absolute knowledge but must proceed on the basis of what is known. Schools of education have been reluctant, for whatever reasons, to identify that body of data. Thus, the real impediment to establishing a common knowledge base is the failure to educators to collect, synthesize, and institutionalize pertinent research information (27:37-8).

The most comprehensive analysis to date of the research base in teaching and learning was recently released by the Peabody Center for Effective Teaching (16). This report points to the large number of studies of classroom teaching that have been produced in recent years and distills their findings. In essence, the Peabody analysis verifies that few if any teaching skills will apply at all times in all settings. Beyond this, however, the analysis reveals that a number of teaching behaviors are sufficiently generic and should be understood by all teachers. These behaviors, called core teaching skills (CTS), comprise a common body of professional practices that can be adapted to variations in context, learning objectives, and student needs. In summary, this research clearly suggests certain emphases in the classroom and in teacher education programs that are not always present.

There is little evidence, in fact, that this research has had much influence on practice in teacher education. An inspection of the course syllabi used in the teacher education program on this campus suggests that the content of the program here, too, does not reflect this research to the degree that one might expect. State certification requirements suggest that considerable latitude and sufficient flexibility exist for the program on campus to move in the new directions suggested by the current research. Clearly, a leadership opportunity is present for the teacher education program and the University in this respect.

New Accreditation Standards

Even amidst controversy and criticism, opportunities for excellence in teacher education are clear. The evolving body of research in the profession offers both hope and direction for the future of education. The growing interest in experimentation and innovation in teacher education also bodes well for the future. And while the prospect of significant change may at times seem overwhelming, universities like this one with traditions of excellence must be prepared to accept current opportunities for excellence in teacher education and for leadership in the profession.

Perhaps one of the most significant forces in the effort to revitalize teacher education is the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Responding to many of the challenges previously suggested in this paper, NCATE redesigned the accreditation standards for teacher education programs in September, 1984. Although the proposed redesign is not yet official, it is anticipated that only minor revisions will be made prior to formal approval of the new standards. Many of the new accreditation requirements have direct implications for the teacher education program in the University. Significant components of the NCATE standards and criteria are outlined here in order to provide an additional context for the recommendations that will be made at the conclusion of this paper.

Academic Standards and Criteria

> The teacher education unit assesses the basic skills of education students through standardized tests and other measures prior to program admissions.
>
> The unit assesses the academic and professional competencies of education students at exit from the program.

Administrative Standards and Criteria

> The teacher education unit (college, school, or department) has responsibility and authority for setting and achieving goals; establishing appropriate policies for governance, program, admission, and retention; making program decisions; utilizing resources; and developing linkages.
>
> The institution has developed arrangements with school districts in the area to provide professional development services to first year teachers as an extension of their basic teacher preparation program.

The program develops and maintains a positive working relationship with local schools in the area to promote effective preparation of educators, to develop further the knowledge base in school research and practice, and to improve the delivery of quality education in schools.

The unit ensures the involvement of teachers and other education professionals on policy-making and advisory bodies. The unit and local schools cooperatively develop research questions and inquiry strategies to encourage the involvement of practicing professionals with teacher educators.

The program is administered in an organized, unified, and coordinated manner.

Clinical Field Experience Standards and Critieria

The curriculum includes clinical and field-based experiences throughout the program. The experiences should be sequenced and occur concurrently with the professional curriculum, providing opportunity for analysis, application, and evaluation.

Student teaching is direct, substantial, and a full day for at least ten weeks. Tripartite teams (teacher, faculty, student) have a well-defined charge and follow written guidelines related to this experience.

Programs reflect evidence of collaboration in designing and evaluating specific components.

Clinical/field-based experiences are systematically selected to provide students with an opportunity to observe, plan, and practice in a variety of settings.

Each aspect of the clinical and field experiences component is systematically evaluated according to program objectives by tripartite teams.

Clinical/field-based experiences include but are not limited to micro-teaching; developing case studies of individual students; tutoring; translating theory into practice; curriculum design and development; use of instructional technology, including the computer; and participating in school and community-wide activities.

Program Content Standards and Criteria

All programs are informed by established educational research and essential knowledge of sound practice. The latest developments in education research are evident in each program.

The professional program reflects use by students and faculty of major journals, participation in research and publications, and use of national reports and research.

The linkage of research and practice in each program area should demonstrate the dynamic relationship between thought and action.

Offerings exhibit a balance between theoretical and clinical knowledge. The curriculum provides opportunity to learn about research on effective practices.

Faculty Standards and Criteria

The faculty demonstrate a commitment to and evidence of inquiry that supports their field of specialization.

The faculty are closely and continuously involved with the professional world of practice in elementary and secondary schools.

The faculty actively and continuously identify the most current research in their areas and translate those findings in a current knowledge-based curriculum.

The faculty are actively and continuously involved in current research and translate findings into the curriculum.

Scholarly performance as demonstrated by the faculty may include, but is not limited to, published research, articles in refereed journals, program evaluation studies, documentation of on-going activities or grant seeking.

Collaborative research across disciplines or within areas is encouraged.

Alternatives for Field-Based Experiences

Field-based experiences are an integral component of an effective teacher education program. Sequenced systematically, the experiences guide a prospective teacher through a range of activities involving classroom observations and diagnosis and analysis. They culminate in student teaching. As such, field activities are designed to integrate theory and practice in a natural setting where students can gain actual teaching experience. Earlier in the history of the University, all of these experiences took place in the University Schools. In 1962, some student teaching was moved from the campus, and by the mid 1970's all student teaching was placed in off campus settings in the region. The observations necessary for pre-student teaching experiences, however, continued on campus in the University Schools. Some of these experiences, too, have since been based off campus in local school settings. Unresolved as yet is the question of whether to continue, expand, or eliminate campus-based field experiences.

Task Force Report. In the fall of 1984, the Task Force on Alternatives for Clinical Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education was formed to deliberate

questions related to clinical/field experiences and to recommend alternatives for the teacher education program. The report issued by the Task Force in December, 1984, found that five alternative approaches to such experiences were acceptable and compatible with the objectives of the teacher education program. While each of these alternatives holds some elements in common (e.g. partnership arrangements, laboratory experiences), the essence of each alternative is as follows:

1 - Conduct all field-based experiences off campus, expanding and improving them

2 - Expand and improve field-based experiences in the University Schools, and continue present field-based experiences off campus

3 - Expand and improve both on and off campus field-based experiences

4 - Continue present K-6 field-based experiences on campus, and expand and improve all field-based experiences off campus

5 - Continue and expand K-6 field-based experiences on campus, and expand and improve experiences off campus

While the Task Force did not achieve a consensus regarding the preferred approach, individual members did indicate their preferences. In terms of first priorities, option one received three votes, option two received one, option three received six, option four zero, and option five received three votes. The lowest preferences given to the alternatives were six for option one, five for option two, one for option three, one for option four, and zero for option five.

The report also noted that a strong teacher education program should be guided by several principles in developing clinical experiences. The principles important to the question at hand are:

> Clinical experiences prior to student teaching should afford opportunities for college students in school settings which provide a broad spectrum of pupils, a broad diversity of teaching styles, and a broad range of curricular offerings.
>
> Clinical experiences prior to student teaching should afford opportunities for college students in model programs as well as typical programs.

Clinical experiences prior to student teaching should be provided primarily with pupils in school settings while some carefully structured simulation activites are also appropriate (26:12).

In addition, the report notes the advantages and disadvantages of continuing field experiences prior to student teaching on campus and of extending field experiences into schools in the region. Among the advantages cited for continuing these experiences on campus are:

Clinical experiences may be more easily scheduled for college students.

Transportation of college students is not required.

Level Two experiences (supervised by techniques teachers) are planned and carried out in a setting controlled by the University.

Coordinating and providing supervision is less complex.

Among advantages associated with extending clinical experiences prior to student teaching into schools in the region are:

More typical class sizes would be available.

A greater variety of teaching styles could be observed.

A broader range of curricular offerings is present.

Greater accessibility to settings involving exceptional pupils would exist (26:11).

National Trends Regarding the Use of Laboratory Schools. In the United States, laboratory schools have been a part of teacher preparation since the middle of the nineteenth century. Their numbers increased through the middle of the twentieth century, but they have declined at an accelerating rate ever since.

Year	# Lab Schools	Rate of Decline
1960	252	
1970	208	20% in 10 years
1980	124	40% in 10 years
1984	85	31% in 4 years

In 1960, approximately 20% (or 252) of the teacher education programs in the country had laboratory schools. Currently, 85 of the 1367 teacher programs in the country, or approximately 6% of the total, have laboratory schools associated with them.

A review of the literature produces little or no research to justify the continuance of laboratory schools. Those associated with them, both professionals and parents, however, have strong attachment to these schools. Despite this attachment, the future prospects of laboratory schools as they now exist are not good. The most vital among them have adopted a heavy research orientation and turned away from their former role in the preparation of teachers. Such schools have apparently followed the leadership of individuals like Hunter who indicate that

> the laboratory school must shed its role as a demonstration and training installation inducting novitiates into accepted and traditional practice. It must become a center for inquiry, an essential component of the educational design to produce new theory, to translate that theory into generalizable practice, to disseminate that knowledge and practice into the mainstream of American education, and to develop vigorous leaders (19:14).

Page too finds little hope for the future of the traditional laboratory school and notes that many observers report their continued existence to be problematical: "Outdated laboratory schools are following the path of the dinosaur" (24:374). Perhaps because, as Hunter observes, "laboratory schools have been singularly ineffective in influencing American education," their gradual disappearance from American education is not surprising:

> With public schools able to provide a similar and possibly more valid service at a fraction of the cost, small wonder such laboratory schools have become vestigial organs in the physiology of teacher education, atrophying or being removed from college campuses at an alarming rate (19:14).

Hunter proposes, in fact, that an expanded research role for laboratory schools may be their only hope for survival. And, as Driscoll and Wheeler (14) maintain, if these schools assume a primary research role, they will require " more space than just classrooms and a budget for personnel other than teachers, as well as for materials and supplies beyond the routine" (19:19).

The Campus and the University Schools. The role of the University Schools in teacher education can be examined from at least four different perspectives.

First, in terms of current usage, university faculty members involved in the elementary education program make extensive use of the University Schools. At the secondary level, there is general conceptual support for the schools, but the level of usage is mixed, depending apparently on the professional judgments made by the faculty members in the various secondary techniques courses.

Second, in terms of morale, while the faculty teaching in the laboratory schools are strong teachers committed to the program, morale has been a continuing problem. The North Central Association visitation reports over the years have focused on the morale problem. Much of the problem is generated by the perceived instability of the schools and the loss of "longstanding master teachers" who had committed their lives to the schools. The likelihood of re-establishing this master teacher concept is remote, both because faculty salaries are lower in comparison to salaries in local school systems and because directions in teacher education are clearly changing.

Third, in terms of quality, the recent NCA report noted several strengths in the instructional program offered by the University Schools. While this is a source of pride for the University, the team cited thirteen areas that need improvement. These suggestions would make the schools more of a model, but would likewise require additional expenditures to improve their quality.

Fourth, and most critical, is the level of future use by students in teacher education. During the last year, a higher than normal number of students completed observations in the school, due largely to a change in certification requirements. Now that the backlog created by the certification change has been handled, about 350 to 400 students might ordinarily be expected to be involved in the laboratory schools. This projection does not account, however, for the effect of the new ACT composite score of 18 required for admission to the teacher education program. Although ACT scores are not available for all students, the effects of the new requirements will likely be significant. Consider, for example, that 51% of the elementary majors and 37% of the

secondary majors completing ED 250 in the 1984 fall semester would not meet the new ACT minimum. Some 48% of the teacher education majors graduated during the last year and a half had less than the required 18 ACT. Sizable declines can reasonably be projected in the future enrollments, given the ACT requirement.

In these terms, the number of students to be handled per year in the schools would more likely be in the range of 200 to 250. Although the ACT 18 minimum will improve the quality of students enrolling in the teacher education program, it will also have a significant effect on the size of the teacher preparation program, the number of students involved in clinical experiences, and the number of needed field sites. With enrollments in education already reduced, an additional decline will undoubtedly force changes in the assignments of faculty members throughout the teacher education program. Retaining the laboratory experiences in the University Schools might, in fact, force a significant reduction in the number of teacher educators in other units on campus.

Cost Analysis. The origin of the question regarding the viability of the University Schools may be traced to budget discussions held in the Expanded President's Council in the spring of 1984. At that time, it became apparent that University expenditures in education were about $5 per credit above the statewide average for such expenditures. These expenditures did not include allocations for the University Schools. When they were included, expenditures in education above statewide figures became approximately $18 per credit hour above the average. Based on the number of credit hours produced, the annual expenditure in education above the state average amounts to some $766,000.

Since the Task Force on Alternatives for Clinical Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education was asked to focus on academic issues and not budgetary concerns, a cost analysis of the alternatives proposed by the Task Force was subsequently made by Dean Holt and me, as Provost. (It is attached to this paper as Appendix A.) The analysis reveals that, currently, some $573,200 of University funds are used in the

operation of the University Schools. The level of expenditure would change in the following ways if one or the other of the alternatives recommended by the Task Force were to be implemented:

Alternative #1 - Reduce expenditures by approximately $400,000
Alternative #2 - Increase expenditures by approximately $100,000
Alternative #3 - Increase expenditures by approximately $120,000
Alternative #4 - Reduce expenditures by approximately $235,000
Alternative #5 - Reduce expenditures by approximately $210,000

Another issue that requires careful attention in the cost analysis is that of space. The University will obviously incur regular utility and maintenance costs regardless of the function of the space. But, the 21,500 sq.ft. occupied on a full-time basis and the other space used part-time by the University Schools is substantial. The matter of space becomes especially important in view of the inadequacy of instructional space available to other programs in the University. Providing comparable space to accommodate the needs of other academic units on campus would cost in excess of two million dollars.

Alternative Funding Patterns. During the last several months, ways have been suggested in which the University Schools might be funded from sources other than University funds. While these options may have appeal, they must be considered with extreme caution. A few comments in this regard seem particularly pertinent here. First, personnel costs consume a major portion of the budget for the University Schools. If alternative funding sources were used, a 10 percent increase in faculty salaries (which is likely next year) would require a corresponding increase of 50 to 70 percent in the level of outside support. This approach might be viable for a year or so. However, continued increases in the level of outside support of this magnitude seem unlikely.

Second, increasing the costs paid directly by individual students would compound current criticism of the homogeneous socio-economic and ethnic character of the student body in the University Schools and would reinforce concern that the schools

do not provide a "realistic setting" for prospective teachers. For example, currently 5% of the students in the school are black, although 15% of the population of Cape Girardeau is black. Increasing the number of blacks in the existing program to 15% would require the addition of 25 black students. If their families were not capable of paying tuition, scholarships would need to be provided. This, in turn, would require additional support from other parents or outside agencies.

Third, while any move to provide supplemental support would certainly be well intended, such action might not be in the best interests of the University, the students, or the region. Academically sound reasons exist for providing students with field-based experiences in the local schools. School systems in the region would be well served by partnerships with the University in behalf of better education. The University has many other academic needs (related to instructional programs and faculty/staff salaries) that have far higher priorities. Critical space needs on campus could be partially addressed by reallocating the space currently occupied by the Schools. There are, in short, various institutional needs that can be met by resisting the temptation to seek alternative funding for the University Schools.

Opportunities for the Future

Responding appropriately to the need for change has enabled the University to build a tradition in excellence in teacher education. To strengthen teacher education on campus and to shape the direction of public education in the region, the University must meet the challenges and seize the opportunities for excellence apparent in education today. The University is called, in fact, to provide leadership in teacher education. Answering that call will require substantial change in the status quo.

Revitalizing teacher education, both nationally and locally, mandates review and renewal of every significant element in the teacher preparation program. While affirming current practice in some respects, recent literature in the field insists

that excellence in teacher education demands more than current practice. Excellence demands new initiatives in the areas of curriculum, clinical and field-based experience, assessment of program outcomes, relationships with teachers and the schools, and applied research, among others.

Effecting change in these areas will require the expertise and effort of many individuals within and outside the University. As Provost, my basic responsibility is to initiate the process of change through a series of recommendations that have developed from study, consultation, and reflection. These recommendations are based in substantial measure on the rationale implicit in the position paper, entitled, "Teacher Education at the Crossroads: An Opportunity for Excellence."

Recommendation #1. Construct a Clinical Education Laboratory capable of providing controlled and simulated teaching experiences. This laboratory will serve as a resource center for activities instrumental in relating theory to practice. Such activities as micro teaching, simulation, role playing, diagnosing case studies, analyzing one's own teaching, and teaching in a controlled environment will be possible.

Recommendation #2. Establish a Joint Task Force on Collaborative Agreements with Local Schools. The group, composed of teachers, faculty members, and administrators from the local schools and the University, will focus initially on the selection of sites, the identification of objectives to be addressed, and the formation of team approaches. Additionally, the task force will consider basic tripartite relationships mandated by NCATE and other arrangements that will fully implement the concept of a "collaborative" approach to teacher education.

Recommendation #3. Provide the resources necessary to establish collaborative arrangements with local schools. These funds will be used to provide or purchase professional development experiences for teachers in systems involved in the teacher education program. Priority will be given to the exchange of services as a means to enhance the cooperative relationship between the University and the schools.

Recommendation #4. Establish a Center for Assessment and Research in Education (CARE). The purpose of the Center will be to enhance research and development throughout the region by promoting collaborative research and development projects, stimulating faculty research in applied teaching and learning areas, and disseminating educational studies, research, and reports in the region and, on a selective basis, to wider segments of the profession.

Recommendation #5. Form a Task Force on Curricular Renewal in Teacher Educatio The purpose of this group will be to design a research-based, professional core in the teacher education program. Resources will be made available over a three-year period for released-time, travel, and other support needs. Emphasis will be placed on the development of a current knowledge-based instructional program. Attention will also be given to recent developments and trends in teacher education.

Recommendation #6. Implement fully the new teacher education admission requirements and develop means for assessing the specific competencies and educational outcomes to be demonstrated prior to exit from the program. Immediate steps should be taken to utilize the ACT composite score of 18 for admission to the teacher education program. A cutoff score of 16, for example, could be implemented this fall for enrollment in ED 250, with the statement that other standards (including an ACT composite score of 18 or its equivalent on a standardized test) must be met prior to further progression and formal admission to the program. Additional steps would be taken, in concert with other recommendations, to move toward competency-based experiences.

Recommendation #7. Initiate a complete review of the field experiences included in the student teaching component. Specific focus will be placed on current research, a possible professional education semester, specified expectations and objectives, tripartite relationships, and team teaching/supervising with classroom teachers. This review will be completed jointly by individuals from both on and off campus.

Recommendation #8. Develop a sequenced Plan of Action that details what is required for the University to assume leadership in teacher education. The plan will incorporate both the underlying philosophy of the program and the practical applications of that philosophy. This plan, implemented on a four-year timetable, will move the program toward full compliance with the new NCATE accreditation standards and the basic principles embodied in this paper.

Recommendation #9. Review faculty assignments in the teacher education program to facilitate direct faculty involvement with clinical and field-based experiences. Special attention will be given to incorporating in faculty loads time for field assignments, joint appointments in the local schools and the University, faculty exchange programs, and other team approaches.

Recommendation #10. Initiate a reassessment of criteria for employment, promotion, and tenure for all departments involved in teacher education. When the standards are reaffirmed or new ones developed, individuals will be able to establish professional development plans accordingly. Then, appropriate faculty members will have an opportunity to submit applications for and secure funding for professional development plans that will lead to fulfillment of the new criteria.

Recommendation #11. Develop a structure by which responsibility for the teacher education program can be fully vested in one unit. Specific focus will be placed on procedures that will ensure coordination of secondary programs, the elimination of duplication, and the utilization of common standards.

Recommendation #12. Establish a set of policies and procedures to ensure that students are treated similarly in all teacher education programs. A coordinated teacher education program requires common policies and procedures to eliminate potential scheduling conflicts, to ensure common use of time blocks, to promote departmental cooperation, and to facilitate transportation to field sites. Special consideration should, also, be given to recruitment efforts aimed at attracting academically superior students.

Recommendation #13. Establish the position of Associate Provost for Teacher Education and initiate a national search for a new Dean for the College of Education and Behavioral Science. The Associate Provost for Teacher Education will have a four-year term appointment and will assume overall responsibility for the leadership necessary to fulfill the recommendations outlined in this paper. It is anticipated that the new dean will assume his/her position by September, 1985.

Recommendation #14. Phase out the higher education use of the University Schools as a clinical/field site by May, 1987. The use of grades 7-12 for clinical/field experiences will be discontinued at the end of the 1985-86 academic year. The use of grades K-6 for clinical/field experiences will be phased out by the end of the 1986-87 academic year. The funds saved and the space made available through the discontinuance of the schools will be reallocated to implement the recommendations above. Any remaining funds and space would be used to address other academic priorities.

Recommendation #15. Develop a set of structures to bring together teacher educators from across the campus to facilitate the planned redirection of the teacher education program. This approach will ensure the direct involvement of all teacher educators on campus in the revision of the program. Appropriate means will also be developed to ensure the involvement of selected teachers from the local school systems.

Recommendation #16. Study the implications of the new directions and accreditation standards in teacher education as they relate to the undergraduate content specialty areas and the graduate teacher education program and make appropriate modifications. Emphasis will be placed on applications of the reported trends, plans to respond to the need of "first-year graduates," and efforts to develop additional "master teachers" in the local school systems.

Recommendation #17. Devote specific resources to assist students in the University Schools in their transition to other school settings. Emphasis will initially be placed on students in grades 7-12 and then shift to grades K-6. Attention will be given to numerous planned activities, such as the formation of a "buddy system," exchange programs, and counselor designed educational plans.

Selected Bibliography

1) AACTE, **Briefs.** Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, July, 1984.

2) AACTE, **Briefs.** Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, June, 1984.

3) AACTE, **Briefs.** Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, November, 1984.

4) AACTE, **Briefs.** Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, October, 1984.

5) Binks, James B. and Neubert, Gloria A., "An Inservice Education Model: Teachers and Professors as Coequals," **Journal of Teacher Education** (November/December, 1984), pp. 15-17.

6) Bultman, James and Dirkse, Lamont, "From Mini-to Maxi for Student Teaching Field Experience," **Journal of Teacher Education** (September/October, 1977), pp. 26-28.

7) Chase, Donald J., "Field and Clinical Experiences at Bowling Green State University," Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green State University (An Unpublished Paper), 1984.

8) Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, **ERIC Resource Review: Effectiveness of Student Teachers and Field Experience Programs.** Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1984.

9) Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, **ERIC Resource Review: Characteristics and Quality of Teacher Education Students.** Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1984.

10) Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, **ERIC Resource Review: Followup Studies on Preservice Teacher Education Program Graduates.** Washington, D.C.: Education Resources Information Center, 1984.

11) Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, **ERIC Resource Review: Indicators of Quality in Teacher Education Programs.** Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1984.

12) Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, **ERIC Resource Review: Promoting Change in Teacher Education Institutions.** Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1984.

13) Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, **ERIC Resource Review: Teacher Education Program Quality, Curricula, and Degree Requirements.** Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources, Information Center, 1984.

14) Driscoll, Robert L. and Wheeler, Daniel, **Teacher Education Center—A Displaced Campus School?** Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1979.

15) Egbert, Robert L. and Kluender, Mary M. (eds.), **Using Research to Improve Teacher Education: The Nebraska Consortium.** Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1984.

16) Evertson, Carolyn, Hawley, Willis, and Zlotnik, Marilyn, **The Characteristics of Effective Teacher Education Programs: A Review of Research.** Nashville: Peabody Center for Effective Teaching, Vanderbilt University, 1984.

17) Feistritzer, C. Emily, **The Making of A Teacher.** Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Information, 1984.

18) Gideonse, Hendrik D. and Ellis, A. Jones, **Increasing Research Capacity in Schools of Education: A Policy Inquiry and Dialogue.** Cincinnati: Fleuron Press, 1984.

19) Hunter, Madeline, "Expanding Roles of Laboratory Schools," **Phi Delta Kappan** (September, 1970), pp. 14-19.

20) Maeroff, Gene I., **School and College: Partnerships in Education.** Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983.

21) Martin, Jackson J., "Today's Laboratory School: A Dinosaur or a Phoenix?" Cheney, Washington: Eastern Washington University (An Unpublished Paper), 1984.

22) Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, **Reaching for Excellence: An Action Plan for Educational Reform in Missouri.** Jefferson City: Missouri's State Board of Education, 1984.

23) NCATE Redesign Committee, "Draft Document: NCATE Standards for Accreditation of Professional Education," Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (An Unpublished Report), September, 1984.

24) Page, Jane A., "Laboratory Schools: Updated or Outdated," **Education** (Summer, 1983), pp. 372-374.

25) Pickle, Judy, "Relationships Between Knowledge and Learning Environments in Teacher Education," **Journal of Teacher Education** (September/October, 1984), pp. 13-17.

26) Task Force on Alternatives for Clinical Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education, "Clinical Experiences in Teacher Education Prior to Student Teaching at Southeast Missouri State University," Cape Girardeau: Southeast Missouri State University (An Unpublished Paper), December, 1984.

27) Watts, Doyle, "Can Campus-Based Preservice Teacher Education Survive?" **Journal of Teacher Education** (January/February, 1982), pp. 50-53.

28) Watts, Doyle, "Can Campus-Based Preservice Teacher Education Survive? Part II.," **Journal of Teacher Education** (March/April, 1982), pp. 37-41.

29) Watts, Doyle, "Can Campus-Based Preservice Teacher Education Survive? Part III.," **Journal of Teacher Education** (May/June, 1982), pp. 48-52.

30) Watts, Doyle, "Can Campus-Based Preservice Teacher Education Survive? Part IV.," **Journal of Teacher Education** (July/August, 1982), pp. 35-39.

31) Wisniewski, Richard, "The Scholarly Ethos in Schools of Education," **Journal of Teacher Education** (September/October, 1984), pp. 2-8.